BACONIANA.

VOL. XII. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1914. No. 45.

THE FIRST FOLIO.

DID Bacon correct the proofs of the first Folio? First let us consider what the editors and commentators have said as to the proof correction.

Pope, after referring to the Quartos in these words, "What makes one think that most of them were not published by him (Shakespeare) is the excessive carelessness of the Press. Every page is so scandalously false spelled, and almost all the learned or unusual words so intolerably mangled, that it is plain there either was no corrector to the press at all, or one totally illiterate," goes on to say that the Folio is worse—"This edition is said to be printed from the original copies. I believe they meant those which had lain ever since the author's days in the playhouse, and had from time to time been cut, or added to, arbitrarily. It appears that this edition, as well as the Quartos, was printed (at least partly) from no better copies than the prompter's book or piecemeal parts written out for the use of the actors. For in some places their very names are through carelessness set down instead of the *personæ dramatis*. And in others the notes of direction to the property-men for their moveables, and to the players for their entries, are inserted into the text through the ignorance of the transcribers."

He further says, "Had Shakespeare published his works himself, we should find the errors lessened by some thousands."

Lewis Theobald says, "I shall proceed to consider him (Shakespeare) as a genius in possession of an everlasting name. And how great that merit must be which could gain it against all the disadvantages of the horrid condition in which he has hitherto appeared! Had Homer, or any other admired author, first started into publick so maimed and deform'd we cannot determine whether they had not sunk for ever under the ignominy of such an ill appearance."

Sir Thomas Hanmer: "From what causes it proceeded that the words of this author in the first publication of them were more injured and abused than perhaps any that ever passed the Press hath been sufficiently explained in the preface to Mr. Pope's edition . . . the corruptions are more numerous and of a grosser kind than can well be conceived but by those who have looked nearly into them."

Bishop Warburton: "His works left to the care of doorkeepers and prompters hardly escaped the common fate of those writings, how good soever, which are abandoned to their own fortune, and unprotected by party or cabal. At length, indeed, they struggled into light, but so disguised and travestied that no classic author after having run ten secular stages through the blind cloisters of monks and canons ever came out in half so maimed and mangled a condition."

Dr. Johnson: "His works were transcribed for the players by those who may be supposed to have seldom understood them: they were transmitted by copiers equally unskilful who still multiplied errors, they were perhaps sometimes mutilated by the actors for the sake of shortening the speeches; and were at last printed without correction of the Press."

Capell: "The faults and errors of the Quartos are all preserved in the Folio and others added to them, and what difference there is is generally for the worse on the side of the Folio editors, which should give us but faint hopes of meeting with greater accuracy in the plays which they first published, and accordingly we find them subject to all the imperfections that have been noted in the former."

Clark and Glover, in the preface to Vol. I. of the Cambridge Shakespeare, say that the natural inference to be drawn from the statements in the first Folio preface "is that all the separate editions of Shakespeare's plays were 'stolen,' 'surreptitious' and 'imperfect,' and that all those published in the Folio were printed from the author's own manuscripts. But it can be proved to demonstration that several of the plays in the Folio were printed from earlier Quarto editions," . . . and (referring to Heminge and Condell) "their duties as editors were probably limited to correcting and arranging the manuscripts and sending them to the Press. The 'overseeing' of which they speak probably meant a revision of the MSS., not a correction of the Press, for it does not appear that there were any proof-sheets in those days sent either to author or editor. Indeed, we consider it as certain that after a MS. had been sent to Press it was seen only by the printers, and one or more correctors of the Press regularly employed by the publishers for that purpose."

Richard Grant White, referring to the Folio in his historical sketch of the text of Shakespeare, says: "Beside minor errors, the correction of which is obvious, words are in some cases so transformed as to be past recognition, even with the aid of the context; lines are transposed; sentences are sometimes broken by a full point followed by a capital letter, and at other times have their members displaced and mingled in incom-

prehensible confusion; verse imprinted as prose and prose as verse; speeches belonging to one character are given to another; and, in brief, all possible varieties of typographical derangement may be found in this volume."

Howard Staunton refers to the Folio as follows: "Unhappily it is a very ill-printed book; so badly edited and so negligently 'read' that it abounds not only with the most transparent typographical inaccuracies, but with readings disputable and nonsensical beyond belief . . . the clusters of misprints, the ruthless disregard of metrical propriety, the absolute absurdities of punctuation, which deform this volume, too plainly indicate that it received little or no literary supervision beyond that of the master printer who prepared it for the Press." And in a note he quotes as follows from the Rev. Joseph Hunter's preface to "New Illustrations of Shakespeare": "Perhaps in the whole annals of English typography there is no record of any book of any extent and any reputation having been dismissed from the Press with less care and attention than the first Folio."

Professor G. L. Craik, in his "English of Shakespeare," says, "There is probably not a page in it (the Folio) which is not disfigured by many minute inaccuracies and irregularities, such as never appear in modern printing. The punctuation is throughout rude and negligent, even where it is not palpably blundering. The most elementary proprieties of the metrical arrangement are violated in innumerable passages. In some places the verse is printed as plain prose; elsewhere prose is ignorantly and ludicrously exhibited in the guise of verse. Indisputable and undisputed errors are of frequent occurrence, so gross that it is impossible they could have been passed over, at any rate in such numbers, if the proof sheets had undergone any systematic revision by a qualified person, however rapid.

. . . Everything betokens that editor or editing of this volume, in any proper or distinctive sense, there was none. The only editor was manifestly the head workman in the printing office."

Professor Craik refers in a note to his article in the *North British Review* of February, 1854, in which he discussed at greater length the evidence of absence of editing. After making a detailed examination of the text of the first act of *Macbeth* as being a fair sample of the volume he says, "And what is the result at which we have arrived? In a portion of the text of the first Folio extending to only between four or five hundred lines we have found the number of readings which are either clearly, and for the most part confessedly erroneous, or such as at least do not seem to admit of satisfactory explanation or defence, to be not much under a hundred, or one for every five lines. The measure that we thus obtain of the correctness of the old Folio would give us about twenty false readings in every page, or *about twenty thousand in the entire volume.*" *

In the Introduction to Thomas Kenney's "Life of Shakespeare" I find: "It is manifest, at all events, that several portions of this Folio edition must have been copied from the preceding quarto volumes; and it is equally certain that this is one of the most carelessly and incorrectly printed books, of any considerable importance and pretension, that ever issued from the Press."

Edwin Reed, in "Bacon *versus* Shakespeare," says, "Of the body of the work there was evidently no intelligent supervision." And in a note he says: "Bacon was banished from the Court and from London in 1621 and may not have had the opportunity if he had wished to supervise the publication. We know, however, that he was indifferent to the details of such an undertaking.

* My italics.

He permitted the third edition of his Essays, printed in 1625, to go out so disfigured with excess of punctuation that it is to-day a typographical curiosity. It is literally cut into pieces with commas."

Editors, commentators and critics are, of course, not infallible, but it must be admitted that the foregoing opinions are the opinions of men whose names collectively stand for a great deal in the way of Shakespearean study, knowledge and authority; and in face of their practical unanimity it seems difficult to accept the view that the proofs of the Folio were read and corrected by the author. At all events the above-quoted opinions establish a *primâ facie* case to the contrary, which is entitled to hold the field until reasons are given for rejecting it.

We may look for ourselves at the typographical errors in the Folio and we shall see that they support the conclusions of the editors and others quoted above. I do not see any reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of Craik's estimate of the number as 20,000, but I cannot do more than attempt to illustrate the nature of the bulk by samples, giving a few instances of some of the various types.

I.—Names of actors instead of characters.

Doctor Rolfe, from whom I shall frequently quote in this part of my article, devoted much attention to the errors of printing in the Folio and I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to him. He says, in the "Life of Shakespeare" that he wrote as a supplement to the New Century edition:—

"But the case of the Folio is in some respects even worse than Craik makes it out. He says, for example, that 'in one instance at least we have actually the names of the actors by whom the play was performed prefixed to their portions of the dialogue, instead of those of the

dramatis personæ' ; and that this 'shows very clearly the text of the play in which it occurs (*Much Ado About Nothing*) to have been taken from the playhouse copy, or what is called the prompter's book.' In this play a stage direction in ii. 3 reads thus in the Folio : "*Enter Prince, Leonato, Claudio, and Iacke Wilson.*' Jack Wilson was evidently the singer who took the part of Balthasar. Again, in iv. 2, we find *Kemp* nine times and *Kem* three times prefixed to Dogberry's speeches, and *Cowley* twice and *Couley* once to the speeches of Verges. William Kemp and Richard Cowley are known to have been actors of the time in London. There are other instances of the kind apparently not known to Craik. In *3 Henry VI.*, i. 2, we find '*Enter Gabriel*' instead of '*Enter Messenger*,' and '*Gabriel*' is the prefix to the speech that follows. Again, in iii. 1 of the same play, we read, '*Enter Sinklo and Humfrey, with Crossebowes in their hands*,' where the modern editions have '*Enter two Keepers*,' etc. ; and in the dialogue following we have *Sink* five times, *Sinklo* twice, and *Sin* once for the 1st Keeper, and *Hum* eight times for the 2nd Keeper, The same Sinklo appears also in *The Taming of the Shrew*, scene i. of induction, *Sinklo* being the prefix to the speech of one of the players ('I think 'twas Soto,' etc.). The 1600 Quarto of *2 Henry IV.* has also, in v. 4, '*Enter Sinklo and three or foure officers.*' He was evidently an actor of subordinate parts, and nothing else is known of him except that he played in *The Seven Deadly Sins* and in *The Malcontent* in 1604. In the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, v. 1., the Folio has '*Tawyer with a trumpet before them*,' where the actors in the clown's interlude first enter. Collier, Grant White, Dyce and others, suspected *Tawyer* to be the name of the actor who filled the part of 'presenter' and introduced the characters of the play; and it has been proved that they were right."

See also pp. 126 and 127 of Pollard's "Bibliographical Introduction to the Facsimiles of the Four Folios" published by Messrs. Methuen.

As a further example of careless printing of the names of the characters, I take the following from Craik's article in the *North British Review* already referred to.

"Then there is the blundering in various plays in regard to the names of the *dramatis personæ*. For instance, in the *Merchant of Venice* 'nothing,' says Mr. Knight, 'can be more confused than the manner in which the names of *Salarino* and *Solanio* are indicated. . . . In the text of the Folio we find *Salarino* and *Slarino; Salanio, Solanio* and *Salino*. . . . But if there be a confusion in these names even when given at length in the text, the abbreviations prefixed to the speeches are confusion worse confounded. *Salanio* begins with being *Sal.*, but he immediately turns into *Sola.*, and afterwards to *Sol.; Salarino* is at first *Salar*, then *Sala.*, and finally *Sal.*"

II.—Misprints obvious from the sense of the context.

Among these may be instanced—

(*a*) *Julius Cæsar;* Folio, p. 117; II. ii. 46,* where Cæsar says:—

"Danger knows full well
That Cæsar is more dangerous than he
We heare two lions litter'd in one day,"

instead of "We are," or "We were," two lions, etc.

(*b*) *Romeo and Juliet*; Folio, p. 60; II. ii. 167, where when Romeo, on hearing Juliet utter his name, says—

"It is my soul that calls upon my name,' etc.,

and Juliet repeats "*Romeo,*" the Folio makes Romeo murmur—

"My Neece," instead of "My Name."

See Webb's "Mystery of Shakespeare" p. 271.

* The references to acts, scenes and lines are according to the numeration of "The Temple Shakespeare."

(*c*) *Love's Labour's Lost;* Folio, p. 136; V. i. 56, where the Folio makes Moth say

"The last of the five vowels if you repeat them, or the fifth if I,"

instead of

"The third of the five vowels if you repeat them or the fifth if I."

It is not material for the present purpose to decide what is the correct reading that should have been found instead of a misprint. For instance, it is not material whether "My Neece" ought to have been "My Name" or "My Sweet," or any and which other of the various readings that have been suggested. The point is whether we can believe that if the author had read the proofs he would have been content to let "My Neece" stand without correction. It may even be that in an occasional instance it may be thought that one of my examples of misprints is not a misprint at all. That may well happen, for as one of the commentators has said, it is hardly probable that there is any emendation of Shakespeare that in the present day would command unanimous assent. But the subtraction of an error here and there from the 20,000 is of no importance if it is admitted, as it must be, that there will be an immense number left after readily surrendering every doubtful one.

III.—Foreign words misprinted.

(*a*) *Merry Wives;* Folio, p. 42; I. iv. 47; Rolfe p. 503.

"vnboyteene verd" for "un boitier vert."

(*b*) *Love's Labour's Lost;* Folio, p. 132; IV. ii. 99; Rolfe p. 504.

"*vemchie, vencha, que non te vede, que non te perreche,*"

for

"*Venetia, Venetia chi non ti vede, non ti pretia,*"

(*c*) *Love's Labour's Lost;* Folio, p. 141; V. ii. 533; Rolfe p. 504.

"*Fortuna delaguar,*"*

probably for *Fortuna de la guerra* or *della guerra.*

IV.—Words so transformed as to be past recognition.

(*a*) *Timon of Athens;* Folio, p. 87; III. v. 112.

Vllorxa.

See p. 5 of Preface to *Timon* in Temple edition.

(*b*) *Merry Wives;* Folio, p. 45; II. i. 228.

"An-heires."

See "Reed's Coincidences," p. 70, for an interesting suggestion.

(*c*) *King Henry V.;* Folio, p. 87; IV. iv. 5.

"Qualtitie calmie custure me."

See Webb's "Mystery of Shakespeare," pp. 266, 271.

V.—Errors of Punctuation.

(*a*) *Merchant of Venice;* Folio, p. 179; IV. i. 119.

Duke. —Come you from Padua, from Bellario?
Nerissa.—From both, my lord. Bellario greets your Grace.

The above is printed in the Folio with a full stop after "both," and no stop after "lord," thus:—

Nerissa.—"From both.
My lord Bellario greets your Grace."

(*b*) *Troilus and Cressida;* IV. i. 20.

"And thou shalt hunt a lion that will fly
With his face backward. In humane gentleness
Welcome to Troy! now by Anchises' life
Welcome indeed."

The Folio has a comma after "backward" and a colon after "gentleness," thereby connecting "In

* Example (*a*) is in Roman type in the Folio, and examples (*b*) and (*c*) in italic type.

humane gentleness" with the lion instead of with Welcome.

(*c*) *Merry Wives;* Folio, p. 53 ; IV. i. 32.
The misused parentheses in

> *Evans.*—"What is (*Lapis*) *William ?*
> *Will.* — A Stone.
> *Evans.*— And what is a Stone (*William ?*)

VI.—Some plays divided into Acts and Scenes and some not—some with dramatis personæ, and some not.

Rolfe says (p. 499) :—

"There is another class of irregularities in the Folio which I do not remember to have seen classified, though the separate facts are referred to by many editors. *The Tempest*, the first play in the volume, is divided throughout into acts and scenes. We have *actus primus, scena prima, scena secunda, actus secundus, scena prima*, and so on to the end. The next three plays, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Measure for Measure*, are similarly divided. Then come five plays divided only into *acts*, though the first heading in two of them is *actus primus, scena prima—The Comedy of Errors, Much Ado, Love's Labour's Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The Merchant of Venice. As You Like It*, which follows, has acts and scenes. In *The Taming of the Shrew*, the induction is not marked, the play beginning with *actus primus, scena prima*." The next heading is *actus tertia* (*sic*) in the proper place ; and further on we find *actus quartus, scena prima*, and *actus quintus*. *All's Well* is divided only into acts ; *The Winter's Tale* into acts and scenes. The "histories" are all divided in full, except *Henry V.* (Acts), 1 *Henry VI.* (decidedly "mixed"), 2 *Henry VI.* and 3 *Henry VI.* (not divided at all).

Of the "Tragedies," *Coriolanus, Titus Andronicus*, and *Julius Cæsar* are divided only into acts ; *Macbeth, Lear,*

Othello and *Cymbeline* into acts and scenes; *Troilus* and *Cressida*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Antony and Cleopatra* into neither. In *Hamlet* three scenes of Act I. and two of Act II. are marked, the remainder of the play having no division whatever.

The only plays in the Folio which have lists of *dramatis personæ* (in every instance at the *end*) are *The Tempest*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Winter's Tale*, 2 *Henry IV.*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Othello*. In 2 *Henry IV.* and *Timon* a full page, with ornamental head-piece and tail-piece, is given to this list of "The Actors' Names." The omission in the twenty-nine other plays cannot be due to want of space, as an examination of the book will show. In several instances an entire page is left blank at the end of a play.

VII.—Mistakes owing to dictation—Blunders of the ear.

Furness (preface to *Love's Labour's Lost*, p. 6) surmises that the compositors, sometimes at all events, had the text read aloud to them instead of having it before them to look at, and Clark and Aldis Wright in the Clarendon Press edition of *Macbeth* say :—

"Probably it was printed from a transcript of the author's MS., which was in great part not copied from the original, but written to dictation. This is confirmed by the fact that several of the most palpable blunders are blunders of the ear and not of the eye."

This theory does not, however, command universal acceptance. Pollard (Introduction to "Facsimiles," p. 132) says :—

"It is much simpler to believe that misprints of the class which the theory is introduced to explain were caused by compositors trying to carry too many words at a time in their heads, and reproducing the impression of sound which they had formulated, instead of the sense."

I am not concerned to advocate either theory, but the following may probably be instances of the type of error referred to:

(*a*) *Henry the Fifth*; Folio, p. 87; IV., iv., 38, *asture* for *à cette heure.*

(*b*) *Henry the Fifth*; Folio, p. 79; III. iv. 7, *il & appelé* for *il est appellé.* This looks as if when the reader said *est* (is) the compositor thought of *et* (and), and therefore used the sign &.

(*c*) *Macbeth*; Folio, p. 134; I. v. 26, High thee hither, for Hie thee hither.

VIII.—Duplication of matter.

(*a*) Rolfe says (p. 501):

"The wretched editing—or want of editing—in the Folio is also shown in the retention of matter for which the author had substituted a revised version. . . ." A notable example of such duplication of matter occurs in *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV. 3 (see page 163 above).

At page 163 he says:—

"In Biron's long speech we have these lines:—

> "For when would you, my lord—or you—or you—
> Have found the ground of study's excellence
> Without the beauty of a woman's face?
> From women's eyes this doctrine I derive:
> They are the ground, the books, the academes,
> From whence doth spring the true Promethean fire."
> . . . . . .
>
> "For where is any author in the world
> Teaches such beauty as a woman's eye?
> Learning is but an adjunct to ourself,
> And where we are our learning likewise is;
> Then when ourselves we see in ladies' eyes,
> Do we not likewise see our learning there?
> O, we have made a vow to study, lords,
> And in that vow we have forsworn our books."

This belongs to the play as first written. . . . It reappears in the revision of the speech thus :—

"For when would you, my liege,—or you,—or you,—
In leaden contemplation have found out
Such fiery numbers as the prompting eyes
Of beauty's tutors have enrich'd you with ?
. . . . .
Never durst poet touch a pen to write
Until his ink were temper'd with Love's sighs ;
O, then his lines would ravish savage ears
And plant in tyrants mild humility !
From women's eyes this doctrine I derive.
They sparkle still the right Promethean fire ;
They are the books, the arts, the academes,
That show, contain, and nourish all the world,
Else none at all in aught proves excellent.
Then fools you were these women to forswear,
Or keeping what is sworn, you will prove fools.
For wisdom's sake, a word that all men love,
Or for love's sake, a word that loves all men,
Or for men's sake, the authors of these women,
Or women's sake, by whom we men are men,
Let us once lose our oaths to find ourselves,
Or else we lose ourselves to keep our oaths."

(*b*) Returning to page 502, Rolfe says :

"Again, in the last scene of *Timon of Athens*, the epitaph of the misanthrope reads thus (except in spelling) in the Folio :—

"'Here lies a wretched corse, of wretched soul bereft ;
Seek not my name. A plague consume you wicked caitiffs left !
Here lie I, Timon, who, alive, all living men did hate
Pass by and curse thy fill, but pass and stay not here thy gait.'"

We have here the *two* epitaphs given in North's *Plutarch* as follows :

"Now it chanced so, that the sea getting in, it compassed his tomb round about, so that no man could come to it; and upon the same was written this epitaph :—

"'Here lies a wretched corse, of wretched soul bereft;
Seek not my name: a plague consume you wicked wretches left.'"

It is reported that Timon himself when he lived made this epitaph; for that which is commonly rehearsed was not his, but made by the poet Callimachus:—

'Here lie I Timon, who alive all living men did hate;
Pass by and curse thy fill; but pass, and stay not here thy gait."

Shakespeare cannot have meant to use both epitaphs. He seems to have written both in the manuscript while hesitating between them, and afterwards to have neglected to strike one out."

(*c*) Another instance occurs in *Romeo and Juliet*, Folio, p. 60, II., iii. 1, as to which I quote the following from Mrs. Gallup's Preface to *Anne Boleyn*, p. iii.:—

"Romeo, speaking, says:

"'The gray ey'd morne smiles on the frowning night,
Checkring the Easterne clouds with streakes of light,
And darknesse fleckel'd like a drundard reeles,
From forth dayes pathway, made by Titans wheeles.'

"Then almost immediately after the Friar gives the same lines, with very slight but distinctive changes:

"'The gray ey'd morne smiles on the frowning night,
Checkring the Easterne cloudes with streaks of light,
And fleckled darknesse like a drunkard reeles,
From forth daies path, and Titans burning wheeles.'

"The modern editors cut out one *quatrain* as a supposed mistake, the decipherer discovers by the keys and joining words that each has a place—the first in one work and the second in another."

It will be observed that Mrs. Gallup asks us to regard the apparent duplication as not accidental but intentional!

IX.—Mistakes in the headings.

(*a*) *Two Gentlemen of Verona.* Pages 37 and 38 in the Folio are headed *Merry Wives of Windsor.*

(*b*) Mr. Pollard, in his bibliographical introduction to the Facsimile Folios says (p. 134), ". . . As a good example we may take the first sixteen pages of *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth,* which are interesting also for another reason. It will be found that on page 75 a roman n has found its way among the italic of the word *second.* On page 78 this word is quite regular, but the serifs at the foot of the *P* in *Part* are broken off. On pages 79, 81, 83, 85, 87 we continue to find the wrong fount n in *second;* on pages 80, 82, 84, 86 we continue to find the defective *P* in *Part. Clearly, then, these headlines were not set up afresh for each page, but were transferred from forme to forme, or were left in the forme and the new letterpress placed below them.*" *

If Mr. Pollard's conclusion is right (and it appears to be well founded) it is an awkward one for Mrs. Gallup's cipher, as that obviously involves the setting up of each headline afresh.

The same, or a similar, defective *P* may be observed in the head-lines to pages 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117 and 119 of the *First Part of Henry VI.*, and there are many instances where a letter identifiable by some peculiarity may be seen to recur in a succession of pages with odd or with even numbers, as the case may be. These instances support Mr. Pollard's conclusion.

(*c*) *Taming of the Shrew*; Folio, p. 218, *Actus Tertia,* and *Love's Labour's Lost*; Folio, p. 135, *Actus Quartus,* instead of *Actus Quintus.*

The number and the nature of the errors, and their effect in sometimes hindering, sometimes preventing, the printed page from fulfilling its object of conveying to us the words and thoughts of the author, force us, I think,

* My italics.

to the conclusion that the question with which this Article commenced—Did Bacon correct the proofs of the First Folio?—must be answered in the negative.

This conclusion in no way militates against the view that he revised and added to the text up to the last moment before the copy went to the printer, or against the view that the decision to bring out the Folio was his decision, and that the general direction and control were in his hands, and I do not apply it to the preliminary leaves.

It does, however, put a difficulty in the way of accepting Mrs. Gallup's "deciphered" matter; for if Bacon had inserted the biliteral cypher in the Folio, he would have had to read and correct the proofs, at least as regards the italics, not merely with the ordinary attention of an author, but with extraordinary attention to every letter, distinguishing between forms of the same letter, in many cases almost indistinguishable. And it is a difficulty in the way of alleged Baconian "signatures" and anagrams, if they would have required Bacon's personal correction of the proofs.

G. B. Rosher.

DID BACON DIE IN 1626?

MRS. POTT urged that he did not (Baconiana, 1904). The late Mr. Bompas, M.A., wrote a short article disagreeing with Mrs. Pott (Baconiana, 1904). Mrs. Bunten, in view of some doubt expressed by me as to Bacon's place of sepulture, contributed an article in Baconiana of October last in support of the usually accepted view.

Being thus led to closely study the point for the first time, I find myself drifting to the opinion that the surmise that Bacon did not die in 1626 is justifiable.

Causes Conducing to a Feigned Death.

1. Bacon was eager for the cloistered life. In his letter to Burleigh, of 1592, he remarked, "the contemplative planet carrieth me away wholly."

There were other remarks at various stages of his life to the same effect. When made Viscount, he wrote, "I may now be buried in St. Albans habit as he lived."

2. His marriage had proved a failure. In 1616 Chamberlain wrote of Lady Bacon, "She affords him no manner of comfort, either by her consort or her company."

In 1625 she appears to have been living apart from him in the parish of St. Martins-in-the-Fields, being there pressed for payment of certain parish expenses.

3. The death of James I. on 27th March, 1625, was a serious blow to Francis. James I. had done much to soften the punishments and degradations imposed upon Francis by the House of Peers in May, 1621. The loss of the revenues of the offices of Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor had left him with a crushing burden of debt, only kept in check by the £40,000 fine assigned to trustees for his benefit, and which as a Crown debt had priority.

4. Charles I. was not friendly to him. When he saw Bacon's coach surrounded by gentlemen on horseback as a guard he had remarked, "This man scorns to go out like a snuff."

5. Francis could only partially satisfy his creditors, even if he divested himself of all his property, such as would take place at death, and he was just enough to desire that they should have all they could as soon as practicable.

6. Great place was no longer open to him; his control of public affairs had dropped from his grasp, and the desire to spend the last years of his life in utter retirement amongst his books must have grown strong.

Some means of escape from an intolerable position had to be found. The notion of suicide was repugnant. In *Hamlet* at an earlier crisis in his career he had set himself against self-slaughter. He had discussed in 1 Henry IV. the subject of counterfeiting death. Said Falstaff:—

"But to counterfeit dying when a man thereby liveth is to be no counterfeit, but the true and perfect image of life indeed."

7. His private letters in the autumn and winter of 1625—6 show that his health was improved and he was in a merry mood. This points to a mind made up and at ease.

Certain Occurrences.

Francis had died in 1592 as "Watson," and also as "Greene." In 1598, as "Spenser"; in "1623" as "Shakespeare." Why not as "Bacon" in 1626? It was no more his real name than the others.

In December, 1625, Francis wrote out another Will. Carefully considered, it reads less like a Will, and more like a Valedictory Statement. The Trustees of the £40,000 fine are directed to withdraw their claims to priority, so that his general creditors could obtain all the benefits available by the winding-up of his estate. The history of his financial provision for his wife is set out, showing that he had behaved and intended to behave fairly to her. All the benefits he had proposed for her are detailed with exactitude, and, subsequently, in the Will, revoked, instead of being struck out. The pension which James I. had granted to him is recorded to show that he had not lost the Royal favour. The original Will is not now amongst the Public Records, having been delivered out on 30th July, 1627 (Spedding, Vol. VII., page 539).

The charge for his funeral was not to exceed £300, so that a considerable expenditure under this head (in

money of that day) was within the powers of the executors had the "Will" been other than valedictory statement. The great charm of this investigation is in the revelation of the completeness and neatness of Bacon's preparatians for "retirement."

As Mr. Spedding commented, "In him the gift of seeing in prophetic vision what might be, and ought to be, was united with the practical talent of devising means and handling details."

During 1625 he was slowly *dying*, but only in the print of the Apophthegms and of the Psalm translations. Then came the elaborate Will. Early in 1626 Francis went from Gorhambury House to his Gray's Inn residence. Neither place was suitable to "die" in. The people about were not all members of his secret literary Protestant and scientific fraternity.

Upon Highgate Hill, remote from London, was a summer residence, so situated that a good look-out could be kept for any approaching intruder. (It is described in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1828.) It belonged to the Earl of Arundel, an old friend of considerable intellectual ability, and the first great English patron of fine arts. I suspect Arundel was a member of the Rosy Cross fraternity. The biography of him in "Encyclopædia Britannica" indicates his close association with other men of that group. From early in 1625 until June, 1626, Arundel was a prisoner in the Tower. The Highgate summer residence was in charge of a man as caretaker. Francis went there to "die." It is interesting to note that of the three persons whose names were afterwards associated (by Royal Society writers) with the "death event," two, Dr. Witherbourne and Dr. Parry) were prominent physicians, and the third, Sir Julius Cæsar, was son of Qneen Elizabeth's Italian physician.

Amongst Toby Matthews' collection of Bacon's

papers is said to have been a document headed "The Lord St. Albans to the Earl Marshall, with humble thanks for a favour." It is as follows :—

"To the Earl of Arundel and Surry [*sic.*].

"My very good Lord,

"I was likely to have had the fortune of Caius Plinius, the Elder, who lost his life by trying an experiment about the burning of the mountain Vesuvius. *For I was also desirous to try an experiment or two touching the conservation and induration of bodies.* As for the experiment itself, it succeeded excellently well; but in the journey (*between London and Highgate*), I was taken with such a fit of casting as I knew not whether it were the stone or some surfeit, or cold, or, indeed, a touch of all three. But when I came to your Lordship's house I was not able to go back, and therefore was forced to take up my lodging here, where your housekeeper is very careful and diligent about me; which I assure myself your Lordship will not only pardon towards him, but think the better of him for it. For, indeed, your Lordship's house was happy to me; and I kiss your noble hands for the welcome which I am sure you give me to it, etc. I know how unfit it is for me to write to your Lordship with any other hand than mine own; but, in truth, my fingers are so disjointed with this fit of sickness that I cannot steadily hold a pen."

Whether it was necessary or not to write to a prisoner in the Tower such a long flowing *letter of apology*, one can, at any rate, marvel at the vigour which the invalid still possessed.

Although Francis enjoyed "dissimulation in reasonable use" (see Essays), he was not in the habit of telling lies.

He states in the Arundel letter that he *nearly lost his life in trying an experiment or two touching the conservation and induration of bodies, but that the experiment succeeded excellently well.* The ineffable and untrustworthy Aubrey, who flourished 1626—1697, relates a tale of stuffing a hen with snow; another biographer has

it that Bacon was put in a damp bed and caught a chill. No experiment such as the conservation of a fowl's body from decomposition could have succeeded by the presumed date of Bacon's letter. Besides, in the "History of Life and Death," 1622, he had already discoursed upon the preservative effect of extreme cold. No. The experiment alluded to in the letter concerned the conservation of Bacon's own body whilst in a state of induration, or, in other words, deprived of sensibility. That is to say, the medical gentlemen who accompanied him, or were summoned to Highgate, gave him an opiate and tricked him out as dead for the candle-lit inspection of the simple-minded male caretaker, and doubtless subsequently removed the "body" to the "utter retirement" of the house of Sir Julius Cæsar, mentioned by Lodge, the latter's biographer. Means of final escape could then be matured. The Arundel letter, which has neither signature nor date, must have been written, not at Highgate, but *ex-post facto*, and handed to friend Toby Matthew to show round. Francis was no doubt perfectly correct in his statement as to his nearly losing his life in trying the experiment. Medical men in that day were not greatly skilled in the use of opiates, and very likely had difficulty in restoring his sensibility. Correctly appreciated, the statements in Bacon's Arundel letter are true in substance and in fact. The precise date when the ceremony of "dying" was enacted we cannot fix. It may have taken place on the 9th April or some earlier date.

It is clear that by 10th April a report of his death was generally circulated. A chorus of poets wrote Latin dirges of sorrow, a careful selection of them being published by Rawley before the year was out.

Wolstenholm, the rich farmer of Customs, fearful for a £1,000 loan, tried to obtain a charging order on Bacon's pension, but failed. In 1627 Bacon's estate

was administered under Letters of Grant, and Wolstenholm and the other creditors obtained about eight shillings in the pound.

All these last mentioned happenings are equally consistent with actual death as with generally presumed death. The significant blanks in this business are the *absence of any register of burial*, and the complete *absence of any account or record of a funeral*.

If the administrators paid any funeral expenses they would have been shown in their printed accounts. But there is no item for "funeralls." The greatest genius of his age, beloved by all who knew him, *placed in the ground silently*. None so poor to do him reverence. This is inexplicable, unless we have to do with a cleverly planned escape.

It was not entirely wise for Rawley to undertake the work of a biographer. If it be necessary to write an exterior account which is not a correct one, a clergyman with fears about his future state, is an unfit person to discharge the duty. The "Life of Lord Bacon" printed by Rawley in 1657 is a reverent account of a master who of course was then dead. But Rawley does the work with much hesitancy. Important matters are left out. Rawley finds it necessary to preface that he *would not tread too near upon the heels of truth*. He cannot bring himself to say that Francis was born in the royal palace of Whitehall, but confuses Yorke Place (the old name of Whitehall) with York House. When he has to name the day when Francis "died," he finds it convenient to name the one day of the year when is commemorated *the death and rising from the dead* of the Saviour. If Francis feigned death, then he could metaphorically be said to have died and risen from the dead. Possibly an interior story giving the true facts is contained in a cipher formed out of the capitals and shredding commas to which,

when reading the 1657 "Life," Professor Arber took so much exception.

"But what about the monument at St. Michael's Church?" some Alice in Wonderland may ask. "You cannot have a monument without a tomb?" I take temporary refuge in the vestibule of the 1623 Shakespeare Folio.

> "Thou art a moniment without a tombe.
> And art alive still."

I agree there was a monument, and think something heavy was placed in a tomb at St. Michael's, Gorhambury, and represented to be the body of Francis Bacon.

An opinion has been more than once hazarded that the inscription on the latter monument has been re-cut. It states that Bacon sat in the manner shown in the statue, and that after he had unfolded all natural wisdom and secrets of civil life he fulfilled the law of nature. The monumental inscription is therefore non-committal.

The 1656 History, quoted by Mrs. Bunten, is a good find. It should be worth buying for the interesting interior story it doubtless ciphers—not necessarily in biliteral.

Its exterior story indicates that when the body of Sir Thomas Meautys was interred below the pews of St. Michael's it was deemed prudent that a Rosy Cross savant should watch the preparation of the site, and prevent any accidental disclosure of the fact that Bacon's body was not there. The performance with the skull of some poor Yorick would confirm the local gravediggers in their impression that Bacon's body *did* lie there.

The cool manner in which Fuller, another Rosy Cross man, refers to the incident confirms my view.

The Trotter 1779 record of examination of the Bacon vault (some time about 1746, the date when the Stratford

effigy was repaired) is also very instructive. Some lead, "*taking somewhat the form of the body,*" was brought out. If the parochial dependent who told the narrative had examined the dust enclosed there, I think no human remains would have been found.

Even the shaped lead has long since disappeared. Search in the crypts as far back as 1851 revealed no remains of Francis Bacon. So reported the late Earl Verulam to Mrs. Pott. So reported another searcher, Mr. De la Poer Kennedy, a St. Albans contributor to *Notes and Queries*, though his report was probably to a London or local newspaper.

Circumstances subsequent in date to 1626 go to confirm the view that Francis was alive after that year. The first was a blunder made by Rawley in the "Sylva Sylvarum" of 1627. He wrote his Preface referring to Lord St. Alban in the present tense, as if he were alive; so blundering Rawley perhaps knew he was, and had to correct his blunder in a side note:—"This is the same which should have appeared had his Lordship lived." But surely this was another blunder, as *had his Lordship been alive he would have written his own Preface.* Mrs. Pott mentioned a book with a piece to Lord St. Alban "in his retirement, 1629." This is corroborative, unless it can be explained away as figurative or due to typographical error. Then the biographer of Sir Julius Cæsar affirms that Bacon wrote many valuable works in *utter retirement at the house of Sir Julius.*

The testimony of the "Manes Verulamiani," printed 1626, is very confusing. Certain literary and clerical friends mourn in print as though they believed the great Verulam to be dead. Those of them we know to have been intimate friends were Sir William Boswell (literary executor), Rawley, the private chaplain, and the Revd. George Herbert. It should be helpful to note their

respective laments. Boswell expresses himself feelingly, but he was out of England, as resident minister at The Hague. Rawley merely refers to "the loss," a singularly placid expression from one so devoted. All Herbert ventured to write was: "It is evident that in April alone you could have died."

This allusion to the re-birth or resurrection of nature may have been a permissible subterfuge. Of the remainder, one startles us by asserting: "He is gone—is gone, but I will not say he is dead." Another is bold enough to exclaim: "Think you foolish traveller that the leader of the Choir of the Muses and of Phœbus is interred in cold marble? Away. You are deceived!" True, he qualifies this by adding that the Verulam star now glitters in ruddy Olympus, and so on, but even the qualification is ambiguous. One more ventures upon: "I think that if he comes not back to us neither will gifts like these be seen again."

The dirges are consistent with the proposition that some believed Francis to be dead, and that others knew he was not dead, and nervously trimmed their verses.

It was an era of planned mystification. Until researchers are prepared with a disrespectful unwillingness to be ensnared by innocent-looking surface statements in the printed books of the period, the interesting secrets therein embedded will not be brought to light.

Why Thomas Powell, in the "Attourney's Academy" of 1631, permitted himself still to address Francis as though he were living is another puzzling question:—

> "Oh give me leave to pull the curtain by
> That hides thy worth in such obscurity."

HERMES is said to be another name for MERCURY, the messenger of the gods. The ancients attributed him to be the first inventor of secret means of communication.

Hermes Stella was a sub-title associated by Francis with one of his early drafts. I feel certain that Francis wrote the introduction signed "H. S." to the 1593 "Arcadia."

We learn from the bi-literal decipher that he wrote tales and plays under the name of "Greene." In "Greene's Funeralls," 1594, "Greene" was alluded to in complimentary lines, of which the following is one :—

"For flueut tongue, for eloquence, men MERCURY him deemed."

On the point of whether Francis was alive after 1626, two seventeenth century books referring to MERCURY seem to throw a little light.

The first, called the "Repertoire of Records," was anonymous. It bore date 1631, and has been since attributed to the Thomas Powell above mentioned and also to Arthur Agarde. Mr. W. E. Clifton, who owns one of the few copies now extant, drew my attention to its curious verse dedication. I give part of it :—

"TO THE UNKNOWN PATRON.

This work I did intend to MERCURY
Before his wings were sicke and he could fly :
But now the gods incensed, all together
Have lay'd diseases upon every feather.
Alas, he cannot raise himself *nor carry*
His plumes, as does the rest of all the Ayrie :
But is retired to some shady Grove
To hide him from the great incensed Jove.
And where to find my Patron to deliver
This little worke of mine ; I know not, neither
If he were found (and no discretion lost)
This title might offend him, or me most."

The dedication concludes :—

"And tell him thou camst from an unknown friend
Whose love's a circle round without an end."

This is a very plain hint at cipher, and seeing that

directions about a figure cipher have been discovered in it by Mr. Clifton, and references to sealed bags of secret papers, there is no doubt it is a very important book.

Further on he refers to the same patron as "The great Master of this Mysterie." (☞).

The other book is "MERCURY, or the Swift and Secret Messenger," dated 1641, with an initial verse on the most learned MERCURY the younger.

It has a dedication to Lord Berkeley, initialled by "J. W." his chaplain. "The Anatomy of Melancholy," 1621, was also dedicated to Berkeley. We know that "J. W." was John Wilkins, afterwards Bishop of Chester, a member of the Invisible College and a founder of the Royal Society, yet the book contains a verse:

"TO THE UNKNOWN AUTHOR.

By hiding who thou art seek not to miss
The glory due to such a work as this."

I am tolerably satisfied by the 287 count that the four works: (1) "Discovery of a New World," (2) "Earth a Planet," (3) "Mercury," and (4) "Mathematical Magick," which after Wilkins' death were put down to Wilkins' authorship, are connected in some curious way with Bacon, also styled "Francis Rosicrosse," "Mercury," and "Learned Verulam." The man who wrote the dedication to "Mercury" wrote the dedication in "Venus and Adonis," 1593. Of this I feel assured.

There is a reference in "Resuscitatio," 1671, to Bacon having made "a holy and humble retreat into the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant above fate and fortune till heaven was pleased to summon him to a more glorious and triumphant rest." (Address to the Reader, 2nd part).

Mrs. Pott was assured by a Rosicrucian friend that Bacon died in Germany. This may account for the remarkable frontispiece to the German edition of

Bacon's acknowledged works and for the portraits of him in the "Bornitius Emblem Book" of 1659, also printed in Germany.

If he did live after 1626, he would have had further opportunity for hiding books and MSS. already hinted at in the "Manes":—"*Pars sepulta Jacet.*"

This may restore the status of the 1638 "Arcadia" as containing ciphered instructions by Francis (at present ineffectively studied) for finding out some of them.

If, as I believe, the "Spenser" Tomb was placed in Westminster Abbey in 1620 for the eventual reception of the earthly remains of Francis Bacon, the inscription upon the tomb ought to help as to knowledge of the year of death. Owing to it having been "restored," the inscription on the tomb itself is of no use. Mr. Cuningham's valuable researches lead me to infer that the dates of birth and death were at first left out of the "In Memoriam" inscription. So we may turn with more confidence to the inscription as given in the "tomb" frontispiece in the 1679 edition of the "Spenser" poems. The dates there supplied are—born 1510, died 1596.

The publication of this edition and the restoration to it of the line:—

"Now he is dead and lyeth wrapt in lead"

is indicative not only that Francis was dead, but that his body had obtained sepulture suitable to this great though unrecognised Prince of the House of Tudor. The dates may be intended to indicate ambiguously his age at death, viz., 86, which consequently had occurred in the year 1646. So the grave of the obscure Tudor, at the foot of the Shakespeare statue in Westminster Abbey, most likely contains the body of Francis Bacon. The official Abbey Catalogue tells us this obscure Tudor sought sanctuary in the Abbey.

If events did occur such as I have detailed it would

be correct to say that Francis Bacon did seek sanctuary within the walls of that old and sacred edifice.

These considerations deter me from accepting as final the adduced "proofs" that Bacon actually died in 1626.

PARKER WOODWARD.

BACON AND PORTUGAL.

WE have the authority of the French biography in "La Vie Naturelle," published at an earlier date than any English one, for believing Francis travelled in Spain. Surely it behoves Baconians to investigate when he was there, what were the experiences, the results, of his visit? If we turn to his "State of Christendom," written 1580, we find this:

"The King of Spain, Philip, son to Charles V., about 60 years of age, a prince of great understanding, subtle and aspiring, diligent and cruel. . . . His last attempt on Portugal deserveth exact consideration. . . . He worketh on the foundation his father laid to erect monarchy, the which, if he succeed in the conquest of Portugal, he is likely to achieve unless death do cut him off.

"He maintaineth galleys to the amount of 140, whereof there are 60 in Portugal.

"He hath kept France in continual broil. . . . At this present, the King is about to restore Don Antonio, King of Portugal, whereto are great *levies* and preparation. . . . Don Antonio, elect King of Portugal, thrust out by the King of Spain, of 45 years of age, sober and discreet, is now in France, where he hath levied soldiers, whereof part are embarked, hoping by the favour of that king, and the goodwill the Portugals do bear him, to be restored again."

On 30th January, 1580, Henry, Cardinal, King of Portugal died, at which time neither Francis or England generally knew Portugal's wishes with regard to its future sovereign. Later in 1580, Francis in "The State

of Christendom" shows considerable knowledge of and interest in Portugal and Don Antonio. Speaking confidently of Portugal's views with regard to that Prince he says:

"Beside in his person his election to be noted with the title he claimeth very singular, and seldom the like seen, being chosen of all the people."

It is a fact of no small moment that among Anthony Bacon's private papers we find the clue to Francis' knowledge of Portugal's affairs, though, like the diplomatist he was, Francis placed a finger on his lip and kept all the details secret that Anthony's note discovers. Thomas Birch in his "Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth" ("British Museum," Vol. I., p. 14), gives the substance of a paper which he found among Anthony Bacon's correspondence, entitled:

"A note of special services performed by Edward Burnham for Her Majesty at the commandment of the Right Honorable Sir Francis Walsingham, Knt., Her Majesty's principal Secretary, and My Honorable Master." The paper gives details of an embassage undertaken by Burnham in France in the year 1577 (the year Francis first went to France) for the Queen and Walsingham, which secret journey was performed before the Duke of Anjou made his first voyage to the Low-Countries, after which Mr. Burnham returned to England with a relation of the "State of things agreeable to the Secretary's instructions, with which both he and the Queen herself (as Anthony takes the trouble to tell), were extremely satisfied."

It is most important to note that Sir Amyas Paulet wrote in the latter part of 1577 to Sir Nicholas Bacon to tell him his son was safe and sound and in good health after a perilous journey! [See "Bacon in France," BACONIANA, Vol. IX., p. 53]. He rejoices

much that Francis has safely passed the "brunt" of it, and has proved himself worthy of his father's favour! He alludes to the troubles in the Low-Countries, and says that it "is not certainly known yet what course France means to pursue"; showing clearly that as yet the Duke of Anjou had not made his fresh voyage there. It was exactly at this time that Edward Burnham had been sent by Walsingham's order into Picardy, to Calais, Boulogne, Montreuil, Abeville and Amiens to see and learn what French forces were there levied to enter the Low Countries, passing through Licques, where he had a conference with Monsieur de Licques, and another conference with Monsieur de la Motte, Governor of Gravelling.

Sir Amyas' report to the Queen by Francis in March, 1578, with regard to his political work is most "Commendatory," coming from a man of great note in his time for political wisdom and abilities. "Of great hope, endued with many and singular parts, one, who, if God gave him life would prove a very able and sufficient subject to do Her Highness good and acceptable service" (State Paper Office, French Correspondence, Spedding, Vol. I., p. 8).

Rawley himself tells us at this particular time Francis accomplished in France some work political given him to do "with great applause," and "returned to France again with intention to continue for some years there." Anthony Bacon further acquaints us with the fact that Mr. Burnham, after handing in his report to high quarters, was despatched to Sir Amyas Paulet to Paris, and thence to Rheims, to see "what ill-affected subjects of her Majesty were there." After which, disguised as a cornet of horse to an Italian gentleman in Paris, he sought the protection of his friend, a nobleman in the camp of Don John, of Austria, then besieging Limburg, and continued there fifteen days,

till that city was taken, after which he reported on the state of that camp and the enemies' garrison to Lord Cobham and Walsingham then at Antwerp.

In October, 1578, he was sent to the camp of the Prince of Parma, his relation of how that Prince was liked by the nobility being approved by the Queen and Walsingham. Bacon in his "State of Christendom" mentions this Prince Alexander as then acting "General in the Low Countries to the King of Spain," but makes no further remark about him. In 1579, Francis went over to England on receiving the news of Nicholas Bacon's rather sudden death, of which he had a psychic announcement. In January he was still in England, and then as Anthony Bacon tells in his interesting special note, Cardinal Henry, King of Portugal, died, and Don Antonio, doubtful as to whether he or Philip II. was to be elected in his place, sent to Queen Elizabeth his ambassador, John Roderigo de Zenza, with the result that Edward Burnham was despatched at once to Portugal to report on the attitude of the Portugals. Perhaps it is not so very surprising that young Francis tells us confidently that: "all the people of Portugal chose Don Antonio as their King"; their country having been, as he says, "usurped by no other title than strength and vicinity."

He spoke by the card then, just as later in his "Discourse in praise of Queen Elizabeth" he shows intimate acquaintance with her policy in respect of Spain, saying how she foiled Philip's ambitions by the secret and prompt action she took in regard to them. The Low-Countries, he says in the same Discourse, "were warred upon by Spain because he seeketh . . . to plant there an absolute and martial government, and to suppress their liberties the like attempted . . . at Arragon." "It is her government and her government alone," he adds, "which hath left this proud nation from overrunning all."

Anthony Bacon gives most interesting details of Edward Burnham's dangerous quest in Portugal. Besides being a good linguist and gifted with qualities of secrecy, discretion, and bright intelligence, the messenger sent on that hazardous journey showed no little dramatic acumen, assuming characters at will so as to deceive the very elect.

In all these respects Francis shined. Take him all round the Queen could have found no better secret envoy than he. Walsingham was known to have a genius in his choice of "foreign intelligencers," and would surely not have overlooked the unique qualities of young Francis!

We must never lose sight of the actor in Francis. Mallett in his life of this extraordinarily gifted man, quotes Francis Osborne, who says: "In conversation, he [Francis] could assume the most differing characters, and speak the language proper to each, with a facility that was perfectly natural, for the dexterity of the habit concealed every appearance of art. A happy versatility of genius which all men wish to arrive at, and one or two once in an age are seen to possess." "Maturity of discretion and judgment," Mallet remarks, were also his special dower. What an expert in acting he was, especially when Ben tells us, "he accompanied what he spoke with all the expression and grace of action." Taking this side of him into consideration, the Portugal quest, though extremely dangerous, would have had for him endless fascination. What Baconians, of course, would wish to find, would be a relation of his experiences in Spain and Portugal. He who, in his Essay of Travel, so impressed on our minds to be sure and keep a diary when travelling, *must* have placed a record of this special journey somewhere safe, if he really took it. Mallet says, "the native bent of his mind strongly turned to reflection and enquiry suffered him not to stop short at

the study of languages, but led him to remark on the customs and manners of those that spoke them." If any reader connected with Spain and Portugal can help us in the search of a lost diary, may I earnestly implore them to do so?

From its romantic side this visit to Portugal would have appealed strongly to Francis. "The Gold of Guinea, the silks of Goa, the Spices of the Phillipines, made Lisbon one of the marts of the world," as Green, the Historian, tells us. The Queen's envoy continued in Lisbon twenty-two days, the danger of his adventure requiring him to assume the character of the servant to a factor of Mr. Bird, merchant. He may possibly have taken many disguises, for during the next three months he was continually exposed to danger, and was strictly examined at several places, particularly by Conde de Lemos, because news came out of Arthur Lord Grey, of Wilton, having put to the sword Spaniards who had landed in Ireland. Indeed he had no sooner embarked twelve hours on his return to England when orders arrived, from Philip of Spain, for his apprehension. It seems that Don Bernardo de Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador in England, had received intimation of this secret voyage to Portugal, and had sent over a description of the stature, countenance, and particular marks to know the Queen's envoy by, and so pierce his clever disguises. Was it from January, 1580, to June, that Francis Bacon travelled in Spain and Portugal under the very possible pseudonym of Edward Burnham? There was plenty of time, even allowing for the time a journey to Spain took in those days, for him to go, and stay some months, and return before carrying messages to Catherine de Medici and Henry III. in Paris, and joining Montaigne at Beaumont in September. The Conquest of Portugal, by Philip of Spain, at this time drew France and England into close relations, and

Catherine de'Medici hoped to unite the two countries by marriage of Elizabeth with the Duke of Anjou. I have already stated my reasons for believing that Francis had in 1577 been with John Sturm in Strasburg, under the name of *Edward* (BACONIANA, p. 85, Vol. VII.). A Mr. Burnham is mentioned in the "Sydney Papers," in "Collins' Letters and Memorials of State" (Vol. II., p. 302), and by Sir Dudley Digges in his "Complete Ambassador"; and by Sir Thomas Lake, Walsingham's amanuensis, in connection with Essex in 1599, who says that he could not send letters by Burnham because Essex sent him out of the way; which was just the time, curiously enough, that the Queen ordered Anthony Bacon away from Essex House. Essex was employing Anthony at that time in very extensive correspondence as the best intelligencer he could command for all parts. Francis' name was apparently rather a sacred one in high quarters, and silence and secrecy seems to have attached itself to it from early days. I sometimes go further and wonder whether Burnham was used as a pseudonym not only for Francis Bacon but for Anthony Bacon also when it was wanted? If any Baconians can add any light on this subject I shall be glad to receive it. I hope later to trace some connection between Spain's early dramatic literature and our own immortal plays. It seems more than likely that through Francis's personal connection with the peninsula the original form of *Twelfth Night* may have found its way from Spain and France to England!

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

(Continued.)

IN the October BACONIANA we gave several contemporary references to Lord Bacon's death and burial, and mentioned the desecration of his tomb by Dr. King on the occasion of the burial of Sir Thomas Meautys in the vault of St. Michael's Church. As Sir Thomas Meautys had been the confidential secretary of the Lord Chancellor, and his heir to the estate of Gorhambury, it devolved on us to try and find any reference he might have made to the loss of his friend and patron, and if he had touched on the great man's funeral, of which he must have had the arrangements. This necessitated a good deal of search, and the only reward came through the private correspondence of Jane, Lady Cornwallis, 1613 to 1644, from the original letters in possession of the family.

A few words here may be necessary to show Lady Cornwallis's connection with the Bacon family, and her friendship with Mr. Thomas Meautys, who was afterwards knighted. This lady was the daughter of Hercules Meautes, and his wife Phillippe (the latter being a daughter of Richard Cooke, of Gedea Hall). She married, firstly, Sir William Cornwallis, and on becoming his widow, she consented to bestow her hand and considerable fortune on Nathaniel Bacon, ninth son of Sir Nathaniel Bacon, of Culford, in Suffolk, who was a son of Sir Francis Bacon's half-brother. She still continued to be called Lady Cornwallis after her marriage, until her husband, Nathaniel Bacon, was made a Knight of the Bath in January, 1625—6, when she assumed the name of Lady Bacon, or Lady Jane Bacon, and is thus addressed in letters from friends.

One of her most ardent admirers and a constant correspondent, was Thomas Meautys, former secretary to Sir

Francis Bacon. His letters to her are full of compliments, as was the fashion of the day, and contain very little news. This seems at last to have irritated Lady Bacon, who had plenty of brains, and managed her estate and fortune with great judgment, and she got impatient and desired Mr. Meautys to use a more condensed style in addressing her.

He complains of this, but has to comply with her wishes, and, unfortunately, at this very juncture, his patron and friend, Lord Chancellor Bacon, died, and he only ventures to barely mention the fact to the impatient lady, who must surely have come in contact with our philosopher at some time. Here is the letter, written towards the end of April, 1626.

My Ever Best Lady and Cosin,—I am right gladde that I have found out at last, which I understood by yours received, the way and style to make my letters acceptable, which is, I perceave, by being short and making profession of my desire and happiness to contribute anything towards your health and welfare, which I doe as cordially effect now, as then, and shall ever doe the same while I am

T. Meautys.

Your brother went for the Low Countries yesterday with hope to retourne some 6 weekes hence. His lady remaynes with my Lady Sussex. My Lo. St. Albans is dead and buried.

In this one line he announces the death of the great man he is said to have loved and admired, and whose confidence he had enjoyed so thoroughly, and to whose estate of Gorhambury he was heir.

In his next letter we see that the death of Lord Bacon has not benefitted his purse, as he has to beg a loan from Lady Bacon.

Friday, May, 1626.

My Very Best Lady and Cosin,—I received yours by Mr. Proud this minute and purpose to write to you again by him. In the meantime I take the freedom to tell you that if upon the death of Mr. Cotton, of whose office in our Chamber I had a second reversion, I proceed, as I am in treaty to buy him out that is in possession, and so get it for 3 lives of my own name, when I will reckon upon your ladyship's purse to assist me with the loan of £600, for about that sum I must deposit at first, and

£300 more afterwards, which is the full rate I must for security. I will either make over the £200 per annum of my brother Glover's, the office itself, or any other security your counsel may advise, etc.

A third letter, dated April 16th, 1628, which was just two years after the death of Lord Bacon, gives us an insight to the trouble he is having in settling with the creditors of his former patron.

My Very Best Lady and Cosin,—Sir Thomas Meautys* and his lady are well, and hath invited me to come over and christen their childe, whereof I can yet return noe direct answer until I have settled some tearme business concerning my Lord St. Albans' creditors, etc.

It is to be remembered that letters of ministration had been granted to Sir Robert Rich and Thomas Meautys to settle Bacon's estate on July 18th, 1627, and it must have taken some years to disentangle the mess his affairs had got into, especially as the bribes the Lord Chancellor had been accused of taking from applicants had been claimed back by the latter against his estate as debts.

The friendship between Lady Bacon and Thomas Meautys is shown by her ladyship lending him money, and the tie was further strengthened by the marriage of her daughter Ann Bacon to him about 1637.

No doubt the marriage with this heiress raised the worldly position of Meautys, who was a man of immense energy and business organisation. He had been a member of Parliament for some years, and a Clerk of the "Council Extraordinary." He was knighted by Charles I. on February 16th, 1640—1. On his death in 1649 he left the estate of Gorhambury to his wife, who afrerwards married Sir Harbottle Grimston.

* Lady Bacon's brother of the same name, who was in the Low Countries.

This sketch of him is merely intended to show his reference to the death of Lord Bacon.

A doubtful passage in Henry VII.

One of Bacon's most popular books is certainly "Henry VII." It takes easy rank after the Essays, and has become an authority of historical value, and a reference book for the life of that Tudor prince, and we only wish that our philosopher had finished the histories, which he began, of both Henry VIII. and of the vigorous princess he knew and understood so well, Elizabeth, for, of course, the most reliable chronicles of monarchs are those which have been written during their life and times by a contemporary.

But as Bacon wrote "Henry VII." a hundred years after the events had occurred, let us glance at some of his authorities. He would naturally turn to the best-known historians such as Polydore, Vergil and Fabian, but he got many facts from Bernard André. It is rather astonishing to find that the principal annals of the reign of Henry VII., compiled by a *contemporary* subject, were put together by a blind Frenchman who came to England with Henry, and who dictated his chronicle in Latin to an amanuensis.

Bernard André, this blind historian and poet, has several interesting points in his own life. He was a favourite with the King, who made him his Poet Laureate, and in 1496 appointed him tutor to his eldest son, Prince Arthur. So this friar of St. Augustine from Toulouse became an important English subject, and his manuscript life of Henry VII., in Latin, Bacon had to consult, when wishing to remember some point for his English work. But the strange thing is that Bacon, either from haste, or carelessness, is sometimes not accurate in his reading of Bernard André's meaning, and has made one or two statements open to doubt.

It is evident that Bacon wrote the outline of his history a good many years before it appeared in print; and it was probably suggested by his own proximity to Henry VII.'s palace of Richmond, which was opposite his country residence in Twickenham Park. But he had no leisure to complete the chronicle until after his "fall" in 1621, when he devoted some months to finishing it off, and he sent the MS. to the King, hoping to conciliate James by begging a perusal, and correction of its pages, which that monarch graciously consented to do.

At an early period, a History of Great Britain was occupying the busy pen of John Speed (1552—1629), who published his work in 1611. In its pages are marginal notes giving the authority from which his facts are derived, and we see that three or four have been taken from "*Sir Fr. Bacon*, frag. MS.," and in describing the character of Henry VII., he does not give his own impression, but quotes bodily from our philosopher's MS., which he prefaces by "Now for the character of this famous wise prince (which with reason ought to be set in front of his actions as certain lights of mind by which to discern the fountain of councils and causes). A learned and eloquent knight, the principal lawyer of our time, gives many things of which these selected are very regardable."

He then quotes from the MS. which he has mentioned, and in this way we find that Bacon had written a good deal of his history of Henry VII. long before 1611.

Speed also had to consult Bernard André's MSS., and the fact becomes revealed that both he and Bacon make the same error in their translation of André's word, "laetanter."

In giving the description of the first entry of Henry into London, Bacon writes, "The Mayor and Companies of the City received him at Shoreditch, whence

he entered the City, himself not being on horseback, or in any open chair or throne, but in a close chariot."

Speed, writing at the same time, is good enough to quote who his authority is, which our philosopher never condescended to do. He says :—

"Henry staid not in ceremonious greetings, for that, as Andreas hath said he entered covertly, meaning belike (likely) in a horse litter, or close chariot."

It is to be noted that both these historians announce that Henry was not on view, but in a closed chariot, but the passage in André's MS. does not express the word "covertly" at all, and the word which they have mistaken for "latenter (= secretly, privately), is really "laetanter" in the old MS., and means "gladly or joyfully."

Here is the passage in the original, which can be seen in the British Museum :— *

"*De Regina Coronatione A.D. 1485.*

"Rex ipse Richmundiae comes Saturni luce quo etiam die de hostibus triumpharat, urbem Londinum magna procerum comitante caterva laetanter ingressus est. Ad cujus adventum ego, etsi oculis captus amore jampridem sui ac desiderio inflammatus astiti, laetusque poetico furore afflatus palam hoc carmen cecini."

It will be seen that a different meaning can be constructed from this Latin sentence, and it is more likely that Henry showed the people his satisfaction at finally entering into the kingdom he had so long aspired to, and fought so bravely for at Bosworth, than that he hid his person, as if afraid of an unknown enemy in the land he considered his own by right, and that was giving him a conqueror's welcome.

The conclusion to be drawn is that Bacon consulted

* Bernard André's *Vita Henry VII.*, in Latin, is in the Cotton Library. Dom. XVIII. (ff. 126-228).

Speed's MS., as that history appeared in print in 1611, and Viscount St. Alban's volume (with its dedication to Prince Charles) not until 1622. In this dedication Bacon excuses himself for any shortcomings about the hero of Bosworth.

"I have not flattered him, but took him to life as well as I could, sitting so far off and having no better light."

A. C. Bunten.

THE BORDEAUX COPY OF MONTAIGNE'S ESSAYS.

THE city of Bordeaux possesses a priceless copy of the 1588 edition of Montaigne's Essays. It is a large quarto volume, printed in Paris by Abel L'Angelier. It contains 496 pages without pagination. The margins are covered with notes of the author, many of which are clearly intended to be incorporated in a new edition. In one of these is found the veritable orthography of his name. It reads thus, "Compaigne, Espaigne, Gascouinge, etc., mettez un I, comme à Montaigne." Upon the frontispiece of the volume the words "cinquiesme edition" have been effaced, and the words "sixiesme edition" have been substituted. Above the summary of the title page is written, "Viresque acquirit eundo," an epigram which appears for the first time on the title page of the 1600 Edition of the Essays. The most curious alteration is in the date of the address to the reader, which precedes the table of chapters contained in the book. In the print it is "12 Juin, 1588." This has been obliterated, and the date which appears on the first edition, published at Marseilles, substituted thus:—"1er Mars, mille cinq cent quatre vingt." The author desired to preserve the original date notwithstanding the considerable additions and alterations which had been made in the book.

The corrections, emendations and additions to the text which have been made in handwriting on the margins number between five and six hundred. It is said that the handwriting is generally of a neat character, of good orthography for the time, and of bold strokes, which demonstrate that the author transferred his thoughts to the paper as rapidly as he conceived them.

About one-third of these annotations were incorporated in the first posthumous edition, which was published by Mlle. de Gournay in 1595.

The foregoing particulars are taken from a letter dated 26th August, 1789, addressed to the Abbé de Fontenai, directeur of the *Journal Général de France*, which was published therein on the 12th of November, 1792. The volume had been known and referred to during the eighteenth century by residents of Bordeaux, but the literary world generally was in ignorance of its existence. The manuscript appears to have been deposited in loose leaves in a monastery. Anxious for the preservation of this valuable relic, which was then frequently being consulted, the monks caused it to be re-bound. It is to be regretted that in the binding many of the pages were cut down, and some of the notes were thus lost for ever.

Michel de Montaigne retired to his Chateau de Montaigne in 1571, after having sold his office as Councillor of the Parliament of Bordeaux. The solitude which he sought produced in him a spirit of melancholy, and it was to dissipate this that he turned to writing.

The first edition of the Essays was published in two books by Millanges, a printer of Bordeaux, in 1580. In the year 1582 a second edition was distributed by the same publisher. In this here and there the author corrected sentences and added some reflections, which relate

chiefly to his travels and to remedies for stone, a disease from which he suffered. It is here that he professed his complete submission to the Catholic Church. In 1584 R. Estienne and L'Angelier reprinted this edition in Paris, and again in 1587 it was republished by Jean Richer.

Between the years 1580 and 1588 the life of Montaigne passed through a complete change. He travelled in Germany, Switzerland and Italy; he passed four years as the Mayor of Bordeaux; he witnessed a renewal of the civil war, with its attendant anarchy and political passions. The result of these additional and varied experiences, Professor Strowski considers, is to be found in the Essays. The 1588 edition is greatly enlarged, and is extended by the addition of a third book. The additions are of importance. The chapters are rearranged, the sequence of ideas is varied, and there appears evidence, writes the Professor, of the existence of two inspirations, two problems and two men. The work is obscure to the reader who seeks in it, in vain, systematic thought, but it is richer, more varied and more profound than any of the preceding editions.

Montaigne did not cease to think and to live after 1588, *i.e.*, though his health condemned him to retirement, he continued to enrich his experience and develop his Essays. The testimony of the friends of his old age, Pierre de Brach and Florimond de Ræmond, bears evidence of the fulness of his resignation and gravity. The supreme moment for meditation had arrived. In these last years of his life he devoted himself to the augmentation and correction of his work. At his death, on the 15th of September, 1592, it was almost complete, but he did not live to see it printed in its final form. There is evidence that the notes were commenced *before* the 1588 edition was published, so that the sheets unbound must have been furnished to Montaigne whilst the volume was passing through the press.

The importance of this annotated example of the 1588 edition is recognised, and the town of Bordeaux has permitted its reproduction in phototype. It will be issued in three volumes, and comprise more than a thousand blocks of phototype. M. Fortunat Strowski, Professor of the Faculty of Letters at Paris, has written an introduction to it. A prospectus has been circulated inviting subscriptions,* which is accompanied by a reproduction (Pl. 1,012) of one of the pages. The sheet is covered with annotations, chiefly consisting of additions to the text.

And now an assertion can be made with a feeling of certainty and confidence. *Every word of writing which appears on this page is from the hand of Francis Bacon.* The annotations of Bacon in books, which in recent years have been gathered together, varies considerably, but careful study of the various styles employed enable the investigator to recognise the same hand running through them. Spedding has commented on the changes which took place in Bacon's handwriting, and Edwin A. Abbott, speaking of the various styles of his composition, remarked, "Bacon's style varied almost as much as his handwriting." The examples which are found on the reproduction of this page of the 1588 Essays are in Bacon's undisguised writing. The instances in which he annotated books in English or French are comparatively few. Latin, as in the case of Montaigne, was his mother tongue, and was the language he usually employed when writing in the margins of Greek, Hebrew, or Latin works. It is therefore difficult to make a comparison of actual words. Fortunately the page reproduced contains the words "Socrates" and "Socratique." There is a copy of Plato's works in Greek, published "Basilæ apud Henrichum Petri,"

* Full particulars may be obtained from the Secretary of the Bacon Society, 11, Hart Street, E.C.

in which he has freely annotated in various styles of handwriting. The words "Socratis" and "Socrates" frequently occur in the margins. The following fascimiles will enable readers to judge for themselves how remarkable is the similitude between the two handwritings. In every characteristic they are identical, as will be seen from the following reproductions:—

From Plato's Works:—	From the Bordeaux 1588 Essays:—

It will be observed that in each case the three first letters, Soc, are never joined together. In the Montaigne the c is not joined to the r, and the same peculiarity is found in specimens given from the Plato volume. Then in every case "rati" is written without taking off the pen.

This does not constitute proof that Bacon wrote Montaigne's Essays, but it does show conclusively that he

was concerned in their revision. What is now required is a careful examination of the editions of 1580, 1582, 1584, 1588, and of the copy prepared for the press for an edition in which it was intended to incorporate the manuscript notes, so that the evolution of thought and style may be followed. It is a work which should be undertaken by some French man of letters.

W. T. Smedley.

[Since the foregoing notes were in type the writer has had an opportunity of making a thorough examination of the whole of the manuscript notes on the margins of the Bordeaux volume, and his opinion formed on an inspection of the specimen plate is confirmed. The greater portion if not the whole of the notes throughout the volume are in the handwriting of Francis Bacon. How or when they came there is another matter, but that most of them are from Bacon's pen is beyond question.]

DR. H. H. FURNESS ON DESDEMONA.

BEFORE the publication in the *Contemporary Review* (October, 1912) of the article on "The Character of Desdemona," by Mrs. Hinton Stewart, the MS. thereof had been placed in the hands of the late Dr. Horace Howard Furness, author of the "Variorum Edition of Shakespeare," by a mutual friend, Dr. Hull Platt, who has since also passed away. The latter handed over to the writer of the above-named article a letter from Dr. Furness, beginning thus:—

"Herewith I return Mrs. Stewart's MS., with many thanks for the pleasure I have had in reading it.

"To give more *strength* to Desdemona's character than is usually attributed to it is, I think, truly ad-

mirable, and adds much to the dramatic effect. Should this essay be published, no actress of the part could ever hereafter afford to overlook it."

When reading these words the writer had little hope that her essay, even with all the advantages afforded to it by its appearance in the *Contemporary Review*, could ever achieve such a far-reaching and, as it seemed to her, highly desirable result, or that a new conception was likely to obtain on the stage of this most exquisite of Shakespearean heroines.

Now, however, four years after the above letter was written by the distinguished Shakespearean scholar of Pennsylvania, an accepted English authority has for the first time pronounced in favour of Desdemona's *strength* of character. The Rev. Dr. Stopford Brooke in his "Ten More Plays of Shakespeare" (p. 177), published 1913, writes as follows:—

"Here [in the Council Chamber] for the first time we meet Desdemona, and she is a surprise. We expect to find her, like her father's description of her,

> "'A maiden never bold,
> Of spirit so still and quiet, that her motion
> Blushed at herself;'"

and we find her no such person. No one is more surprised than Brabantio at her dignity, her firm grasp of the situation, her unshrinking attitude before the Senate; not one at all of spirit so still and quiet that her motion blushed at herself. All these years he had never known her, no more than Lear had known his daughters. Love had not transformed her, but brought to the surface the deep powers of her nature—strength of loving, strength of will, firmness in act, clear vision of what to do in difficulty, as when she settled the question before the whole Senate of what she is to do when Othello leaves for Cyprus. She is frank and bold

and firm; not a girl, but a steadfast, clear-eyed woman. But in her boldness there is no immodesty. It is the boldness of deep love. It is the boldness of innocence. It is the boldness of one who is ignorant of the wrong and wickedness of the world, and this innocent boldness in her character accounts for the pleasant frankness of her conversation with Iago in the next Act, and for her natural relations with Cassio, and, alas, for the ease with which she slips into the net of Iago."

In reference to the quotation from Brabantio, Dr. Brooke writes in a footnote: "This description has been foolishly taken by many great actresses as the basis of their presentment of Desdemona. It is Brabantio's idea of her—not Shakespeare's."

One would willingly go still further than Dr. Brooke, and maintain once more that, in Shakespeare's intention, Othello's violence excites no fear in Desdemona's breast; that though, while he is courteous, she is all softness and sweet obedience, her brave spirit rises, fearless and undaunted, in opposition to his rage; that, during the handkerchief scene (III. iv.), her exclamations express scepticism and concern at his vehemence rather than alarm, and though she declines to admit that the kerchief is irretrievably lost, she asks:

"But what and if it were?"

a question than which, after all Othello has said about its magic power, nothing could be more daring; she dismisses him with the frank rebuke:

"In sooth you are to blame;"

afterwards describing herself to Emilia as a "warrior," an "unhandsome" one, who had not made sufficient allowance for the disabilities of the foe.

In the last scene of her life, when awakened from the sleep of innocence and exhaustion, she parleys with her

infuriated husband courageously and most wisely, though fully realising her danger; ever seeking, as opportunity offers, an explanation of his anger, till, at the name of Iago, the whole vile plot is revealed to her intensified and horrified soul, and her presence of mind is shattered; even then her entreaties for one short spell of life in which to prove her innocence are uttered only when her husband is in the act of smothering her in full conviction of her guilt.

However this may be, the time has surely now come when, in the words of Dr. H. H. Furness, "no actress of the part can hereafter afford" to ignore what, it can hardly be doubted, is a truer reading than the conventional one of this pure, gracious, yet most heroic character. H. H. S.

NEWMAN AND BACONIANISM.

THERE is a piece of Shakespeare criticism in Cardinal Newman's "Grammar of Assent" which shows that this great master of English prose might very well have been a great Baconian had he studied the question. "The Grammar of Assent" was published in 1870, before the greatest of modern literary controversies had attracted much attention; and it is the work of which the author is reported to have said much the same as Thackeray of "Esmond": "I stand by this book, and am willing to leave it, when I go, as my card."* It is a book of peculiarly English mentality.

The passage with which we are concerned comes in as illustrating the inadequacy of strict logic for the proof of concrete subjects; the main contention being that "for genuine proof in concrete matter we require an

* Field's "Yesterdays With Authors," p. 17.

organon more delicate, versatile and elastic than verbal argumentation" (p. 264).

I do not intend to give the whole criticism; only what will suffice to indicate what may be called Baconian tendencies of the illustrious author. On the above cited page he says: "I ought to give an illustration of what I have been stating in general terms; but it is difficult to do so without digression. However, if it must be, I look round the room in which I happen to be writing, and take down the first book which catches my eye. It is an old volume of a magazine of great name; I open it at random and fall upon a discussion about the then lately-discovered emendations of the text of Shakespeare. It will do for my purpose.

In the account of Falstaff's death in *Henry V* (Act II. scene iii.) we read, according to the received text, the well-known words, "His nose was as sharp as a pen, and 'a babbled of green fields." In the first authentic edition, published in 1623, some years after his death, the words, I believe, ran, "and a table of green fields," which has no sense. Accordingly an anonymous critic, reported by Theobald in the last century, corrected them to "and 'a talked of green fields." Theobald himself improved the reading into "and 'a babbled of green fields," which since his time has been the received text. But just twenty years ago an annotated copy of the edition of 1632 was found, annotated perhaps by a contemporary, which among as many as 20,000 corrections of the text, substituted for the corrupt reading of 1623, the words "on a table of green frieze," which has a sufficient sense, though far less acceptable than Theobald's. The genuineness of this copy with its annotations, as it is presented to us, I shall here take for granted.

Now I understand, or at least will suppose, the argument maintained in the article of the magazine in ques-

tion to run thus: "Theobald's reading, as at present received, is to be retained to the exclusion of the text of 1623, and of the emendation made on the copy of the edition of 1632—to the exclusion of the text of 1623, because that text is corrupt; to the exclusion of the annotation of 1632, because it is anonymous." I wish it, then, observed how many large questions are opened in the discussion which ensues, how many recondite and untractable principles have to be settled, and how impotent is logic, or any reasonings which can be thrown into language, to deal with these indispensable first principles.

The first position is, "The authoritative reading of 1623 is not to be allowed in the received text, because it is corrupt." Now, are we to take it for granted as a first principle which needs no proof, that a text may be tampered with because it is corrupt? However the corrupt reading arose, it is authoritative. It is found in an edition published by known persons only six years after Shakespeare's death, from his own manuscript as it appears, and with his corrections of earlier faulty impressions. Authority cannot sanction nonsense, but it can forbid critics from experimentalizing upon it. If the text of Shakespeare is corrupt, it should be published as corrupt.

I believe the best editors of the Greek tragedians have given up the impertinence of introducing their conjectures into the text; and a classic like Shakespeare has a right to be treated with the same respect as Æschylus. To this it will be replied that Shakespeare is for the general public and Æschylus for students of a dead language; that the run of men read for amusement or as a recreation, and that if the editions of Shakespeare were made on critical principles they would remain unsold. Here, then, we are brought to the question whether it is any advantage to read Shakespeare except

with the care and pains which a classic demands, and whether he is in fact read at all by those whom such critical exactness would offend ; and thus we are led on to further questions about cultivation of mind and the education of the masses. Further, the question presents itself, whether the general admiration of Shakespeare is genuine, whether it is not a mere fashion, whether the multitude of men understand him at all, whether it is not true that everyone makes much of him because everyone else makes much of him. Can we possibly make Shakespeare light reading, especially in this day of cheap novels, by ever so much correction of his text?

It is clear enough from this that Newman himself did not believe in Shakespeare being a "popular" writer, no more than Bacon did, who often intimated that the works which were to keep alive with progressive vigour his all-embracing philosophy were such as would "select and, as it were, adopt fit and legitimate readers for themselves." They were not to be of the intoxicatingly pleasurable kind which the modern novel is typical of. *Verum gaudium, res severa.* Nevertheless, many of our great writers speak as if they did not agree with Newman on this point—as if any intelligent lover of fiction would take to Shakespeare as ducks to water, a delusion as baseless as the contrary experience is grounded on every-day facts.

I omit the next point of discussion, namely, the claim of the annotator to introduce into Shakespeare's text the emendation made upon his copy of 1632, and proceed to the author's treatment of the third point, namely, "the claim of Theobald's emendation to retain its place in the *textus receptus*."

"It strikes me with wonder that an argument in its defence could have been put forward to the following effect, viz., that, true though it be that the editors of

1623 are of much more authority than Theobald, and that the annotator's reading in the passage in question is more likely to be correct than Theobald's, nevertheless Theobald has by this time acquired a prescriptive right to its place there—the prescription of more than a hundred years—that usurpation has become legitimacy; that Theobald's words have sunk into the hearts of thousands; that, in fact, they have become Shakespeare's; that it would be a dangerous innovation and an evil precedent to touch them. If we begin an unsettlement of the popular mind, where is it to stop?

"Thus it appears, in order to do justice to the question before us, we have to betake ourselves to the consideration of myths, pious frauds, and other grave matters, which introduce us into a *sylva*, dense and intricate, of first principles and elementary phenomena belonging to the domains of archæology and theology. Nor is this all. When such views of the duty of garbling a classic are propounded, they open upon us a long vista of sceptical interrogations, which go far to disparage the claims upon us, the genius, the very existence of the great poet, to whose honour these views are intended to minister. For perhaps, after all, Shakespeare is really but a collection of many Theobalds, who have each of them a right to his own share of him. There was a great dramatic school in his day; he was one of a number of first-rate artists—perhaps they wrote in common. How are we to know what is his, or how much? Are the best parts his, or the worst? It is said that the players put in what is vulgar and offensive in his writings; perhaps they inserted the beauties. I have heard it urged years ago, as an objection to Sheridan's claim of authorship to the plays which bear his name, that they were so unlike each other. Is not this the very peculiarity of those imputed to Shakespeare? Were ever the writings of one man so various, so im-

personal? Can we form one true idea of what he was in history or character by means of them? Is he not, in short, *vox et præterea nihil?* Then again, in corroboration, is there any author's life so deficient in biographical notices as his? We know about Hooker, Spencer, Spelman, Walton, Harvey; what do we know of Shakespeare? Is he much more than a name? Is not the traditional object of an Englishman's idolatry after all a nebula of genius, destined, like Homer, to be resolved into its separate and independent luminaries as soon as we have a criticism powerful enough for the purpose? I must not be supposed for a moment to countenance such scepticism myself, though it is a subject worthy the attention of a sceptical age. Here I have introduced it simply to suggest how many words go to make up a thoroughly valid argument; how short and easy a way to a true conclusion is the logic of good sense; how little syllogisms have to do with the formation of opinion; how little depends upon the inferential proofs; how much upon those pre-existing beliefs and views in which men either agree with each other, or hopelessly differ, before they begin to dispute, and which are hidden deep in our nature, or, it may be, in our personal peculiarities."

We have here, I think, in these comments of Newman grounds for believing that his was a mind naturally Baconian in the modern sense of the word, and that, had it been possible for him to study the question in the light of what has been ascertained since he wrote "An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent," we should be able to add his great name to so many distinguished names of men who in this matter have not allowed themselves to be dominated by all or any of the "idols" which Bacon has warned us against.

William A. Sutton.

MR. GEORGE GREENWOOD, M.P.

READERS of BACONIANA will hear with great regret of the cause of the delay in the publication of Mr. George Greenwood's reply to "The Baconian Heresy." In November last Mr. Greenwood had the misfortune to break his knee-cap. An operation was performed, which appeared to be successful. No sooner was Mr. Greenwood about again but a second fracture took place, which has necessitated a second operation. Mr. Greenwood is now lying in a Nursing Home and some time must elapse before he can resume his usual occupations. His reply to Mr. Robertson was nearly completed when the accident took place, but it has caused a delay in the publication which was anxiously looked forward to.

Mr. Greenwood has courteously placed at the service of the Editor of BACONIANA some pages of a chapter in his book which deal with Mr. Robertson's criticism of Max Müller's estimate of Shakespeare's vocabulary, which will prove of special interest to Baconians, as it justifies the position taken up by their colleague, the late Mr. G. C. Bompas.

It may here be appropriate to say a word on the Shakespearean vocabulary. Max Müller has frequently been quoted to the effect that Shakespeare used about 15,000 words in his plays. Now, upon this statement, Mr. Robertson treats us to the following note: "Max Müller, 'Lecture on the Science of Language,' 6th edition, I., 309, citing—of all authorities—Renan's 'Histoire des Langues Semitiques!' I cannot find the passage in my copy (2nd edition) of Renan. Mr. G. C. Bompas ('Problem of the Shakespeare Plays,' 1902, p. iv.) characteristically asserts that the 'estimate' is Max

Müller's own."* According to Mr. Robertson, therefore, Max Müller did not himself form the estimate that Shakespeare used about 15,000 words in his plays, but merely took it from Renan's "Histoire des Langues Semitiques"—"of all authorities"!—and Mr. Bompas makes the "characteristically" false assertion that the estimate is Max Müller's own. As a fact, however, as I shall proceed to show, Mr. Bompas is quite right, and the "characteristic" assertion is Mr. Robertson's. Max Müller writes: "We are told on good authority by a country clergyman that some of the labourers in his parish had not three hundred words in their vocabulary. . . . A well-educated person in England who has been at a public school and at the university, who reads his Bible, his Shakespeare, the *Times*, and all the books of Mudie's library, seldom uses more than about 3,000 or 4,000 words in actual conversation. Accurate thinkers and close reasoners, who avoid vague and general expressions, and wait till they find the word that exactly fits their meaning, employ a larger stock, and eloquent speakers may rise to command of 10,000. The Hebrew Testament says all that it has to say with 5,642 words; Milton's works are built up with 8,000; and Shakespeare, who probably displayed a greater variety of expression than any writer in any language, produced all his plays with about 15,000 words."† Now here, it is true, we have the following curious note, "Renan, 'Histoire,' p. 138," and upon this Mr. Robertson would have us believe that Max Müller's estimate of the number of Shakespeare's words was not his own, but taken, without verification, from Renan. Then Mr.

* Work cited, p. 517, note 3.

† "Science of Language," 1885, Vol. I., pp. 308-9. As to the labourer's vocabulary, given on the authority of a country clergyman, the reference is to "The Study of the English Language," by A. d'Orsey, p. 15.

Robertson turns to Renan's "Histoire des Langues Semitiques," at p. 138, and tells us he cannot find the passage in his copy. Of course he cannot, and if he had not been in such a hurry to score a point—a false point as it turns out—he would have very soon seen why. It might surely have struck him *à priori* that Max Müller would not be likely to take his estimate of Shakespeare's vocabulary from Renan. The fact is that the note, "Renan, 'Histoire,' p. 138," is obviously inserted in error on page 309 of the "Science of Language." "Histoire"—*what* "Histoire"? It might be the "Histoire d'Israel." But if the reader will turn back to page 307 of Max Müller's work he will find there the reference to the same page (138) of the "Histoire des Langues Semitiques" *in its proper place*, viz., as a note to the words "Hebrew has been reduced to about 500 roots." Let him then turn to Renan's works referred to, at p. 138, and he will find that Renan is here dealing with the Hebrew language. He will not find the authority for Max Müller's statement that this language has been reduced to about 500 roots on this particular page, but if he will read on to page 140 he will find "on evalue le nombre des racines hébraïques à cinq cents." He will see, further, that Max Müller's note, on p. 307, says Leusden counted 5,642 Hebrew and Chaldee words in the Old Testament, and this also he will find is taken from Renan's "Histoire des Langues Semitiques" (1863), at p. 140. It is quite plain, therefore, that the second reference to the "'Histoire,' p. 138," has crept in *per incuriam*, and that Max Müller, as might be expected, makes no reference at all to Renan in support of his statement with regard to the Shakespearean vocabulary. Thus it turns out, on examination, that Mr. Robertson's sneer at Max Müller and his supposed "authority," and his suggestion that Mr. Bompas is "characteristically" untrustworthy, are

based upon his own uncritical error, which a more careful examination of the works referred to would have enabled him to avoid. This is "characteristic" indeed!

Further, we have it on the authority of the late Mr. W. H. Edwards that "in the course of three lectures delivered at Oxford, and reprinted at Chicago, Professor Müller said, 'Few of us use more than 3,000 or 4,000 words; Shakespeare used about 15,000.'" *

Other estimates have put the Shakespearean vocabulary even higher. Thus Craik estimated it at 21,000 words, without counting inflectional forms, while he estimated the vocabulary of Milton at but 7,000. Clark, who quotes these estimates in his "Elements of the English Language" (p. 134), says: "The vocabulary of Shakespeare becomes more than double that of any other writer in the English language. . . . English speech, as well as literature, owes more to him than any other man."

But this, of course, does not suit Mr. Robertson's argument. How could Farmer's *ignoramus* (and I have shown that I am quite justified in using that term concerning Shakspere as portrayed by Farmer)—how could the half-educated man who had such very "small" Latin that he could not translate quite common words in that language, and who, having "less Greek," had none at all—how could *he* possess this huge vocabulary? Obviously the two theories are inconsistent. One of them must go by the board. So the "vocabulary" is thrown to the wolves, and we find Mr. Robertson suggesting (p. 521) "that the playwright was really not a man of supremely large vocabulary *for his time*"! What is the meaning of "*for his time*," I wonder! Is it suggested that Elizabethan vocabularies were normally

* "Shaksper Not Shakespeare," by William H. Edwards (Cincinnati—The Robert Clarke Company, 1900), p. 195.

much larger than the vocabularies of the present day, and that though Shakespeare's vocabulary may be "supremely large" for the nineteenth century, it was not so for the seventeenth century? If this be not the meaning I really cannot see what the effect of the words I have italicised is intended to be. This, however, in passing only. It has been generally believed that Shakespeare's vocabulary is "supremely large" whether for his own time or ours, and until it is shown that Max Müller, and Clark, and Craik, and others are wrong, I think we may continue to believe that the fact is so. My own belief is that the explanation of the phenomenon (assuming its reality) is to be found in the further fact that it is the vocabulary not of one man but of several. Mr. Edwards writes: "This extraordinary vocabulary seems entirely too great for one individual, and hence it has been argued that this alone is enough to show that several hands took part in the Shakespeare plays." For myself, however, I should not cite the vocabulary as evidence of the "several hands," but knowing as we do that the work of "several hands" is to be found in "the Shakespeare plays," I should regard that fact as an explanation, in great part if not altogether, of the abounding Shakespearean vocabulary.

So far the chapter quoted. Mr. Greenwood adds, "Baconians, I fear you will not agree in the last part, but let that pass."

REVIEW.

Uncrowned. A Story of Queen Elizabeth and the Early Life of Francis "Bacon," as told in his secret writings and in other contemporary records of her reign. By C. Y. C. Dawbarn, M.A. Drawings by I. Y. Dawbarn, M.A., LL.M. Longmans, Green & Co., London.

MR. DAWBARN will be remembered as the author of a valuable contribution to the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. A paper on the subject, which he read before the Liverpool Philomathic Society, was published in 1903. The arguments on both sides were clearly and impartially set forth, and if a perusal of it leads the reader to a belief in the Bacon authorship, it will be because the evidence points to that conclusion rather than as the result of special pleading.

"Uncrowned" Mr. Dawbarn describes as an historical romance. He states that the story of Bacon's life, as represented in Mrs. Gallup's cypher works, so haunted him that he could not put it aside, so he wrote it out, and concludes his preface thus: "And now I would that I had not, for it haunts me, and yet 'tis only a tale."

The narrative is cleverly put together. Statements, for which there exist historical evidence, are blended with extracts from the cypher story. Those Baconians who believe that Francis Bacon was the son of the Earl of Leicester and Queen Elizabeth will regard it with favour; those who adhere to the statements of history that he was the son of Sir Nicholas Bacon and Lady Anne, the daughter of Sir Anthony Cook, will regret its publication. There is little, if any, new matter in the book, and no fresh light is thrown on the life, the character, the work, or the aims of Francis. The book is excellently printed and bound.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Francis Bacon was at considerable trouble to assure us, by inductive methods of reasoning, that he was author of the Shakespeare plays. I think I can claim to be first discoverer of the following two instances. This may stimulate your readers to look for others.

According to the K. cypher, one hundred and eleven is the numerical equivalent of the name Bacon. Page 111 of the Shakespeare Folio occurs in that part of "Much Ado about Nothing" where Dogbery and Verges enter.

Dogbery asks, "Who think you the most disartless man to be constable (Be/Con's/table)?" The reply is, "Hugh Otecake,

sir, or George Seacole." The capital letters of these names spell "Hogs." Ergo for Bacon's table = hogs.

Dogbery proceeds to tell Seacole to bear the Lanthorn. Now a seacoal lanthorn is a Beacon. In Elizabethan times Beacon and Bacon were pronounced alike. At the end of the Act Dogbery says, "Go good partner, go, get you to *Francis* Seacole [the italics are mine]. Bid him bring his pen and inkhorn to the goal."

"Seacole" having become "Bacon" "George" gets to be "Francis."

A second instance is in *King Henry IV.*, 1st part.

In this Owen Glendower is made to say :

"at my nativity
The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes,
Of burning cressets ; and at my birth
The frame and foundation of the earth
Shak'd like a coward."

This does not agree with Holinshed, upon whose history the play was founded.

Holinshed only refers to a coincident accident to the horses of Owen Glendower's father. At the nativity (which is the time, manner, and circumstance of the birth) of Glendower *of the play*, the front of heaven was full of burning cressets = beacons. Specimens of the beacons of the period are on the title page of Gustavo Sileno, 1624 (see the facsimile in Sir E. Durning-Lawrence's book, "Bacon Is Shakespeare").

Owen Glendower of the play was therefore born under Baconian (beaconion) auspices. A sphere ("the frame and foundation of the earth") shaked at his birth, *ergo :*

Shak—speare bore him.

Another Owen seems bent on making history in South Wales.

After two failures, one wonders whether a third will follow. If his guides are no better than those used on the occasions of the first and second searches, a prediction in *Henry IV.*, first part, is likely to be realised in Dr. Owen's instance :

"Thrice from the banks of Wye
And sandy-bottomed Severn have I sent him
Booteless home, and weather beaten back."

PARKER WOODWARD.

Literary Legends.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Since my little article under the above heading appeared in BACONIANA, I have come upon an extract from a work, written with no special reference to the Bacon-Shakespeare con-

troversy, so confirmatory of the views I have endeavoured to support as to the concealment of authorship in Tudor times, that I have affixed it to the reprint of the article now in pamphlet form, and will ask you, if you can spare the space, to allow it to appear here. It is this :—

"That" (the Tudor period), says the writer, "was not only a time of severe repression and harsh government, but also a time when free speech was impossible. Able men could only dissemble and speak in allegory. The Plays of Shakespeare and other writers are, doubtless, a reflection of the period; the names but a disguise—the Playwriters merely the spokesmen of those who would have been sent to the Tower and Block, if they had expressed their opinions openly."

The extract is from a work entitled "The Rise of English Culture" by Edwin Johnson, M.A. (London)—a work which, though published in 1904, and from the pen of one of the ablest classicists of the day (*teste* his distinguished tutor Dr. W. Smith, of Dictionary fame), and one who, it would seem, like Bacon, had taken "all knowledge to be his province" —a work too, which had been pronounced by a few capable critics (chiefly abroad) as "one of the most important works of the century"—seems as yet almost unknown to readers in this country. For this reason I would heartily commend its perusal (if they can prôcure a copy) to my brother Baconians, whose theory it powerfully, though incidentally and unintentionally—and the more so for that reason—supports.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

King Henry IV.—First part.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

HOLINSHED referring to Owen Glendower wrote :—

"Strange wonders happened at the nativity of this man; for the same night he was born, all his father's horses were found to stand in blood up to their bellies."

This was a "tall" statement. The author of the play amused himself by going one better. Glendower, "I cannot blame him, at my nativity, the front of heaven was full of fiery shapes, of burning cressets, and at my birth, the frame and the foundaof the earth shaked like a coward."

When therefore the Glendower of the play (not of history) was born his nativity was under the light of beacons (Bacon) and the sphere, viz, the frame and the foundations shaked. —"Shake sphere bore him tremblingly." Q.E.D.

[*Several articles and a number of letters are held over until the next number appears for lack of space.*]